



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/670,063	09/26/2000	Hideo Asano	SJO920000073US1	5107

46917 7590 09/03/2008  
KONRAD RAYNES & VICTOR, LLP.  
ATTN: IBM37  
315 SOUTH BEVERLY DRIVE, SUITE 210  
BEVERLY HILLS, CA 90212

EXAMINER
----------

EL CHANTI, HUSSEIN A

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2157

MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
-----------	---------------

09/03/2008

PAPER

**Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.**

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.



## DETAILED ACTION

1. This action is responsive to amendment received on June 2, 2008. Claims 12-44 were canceled. Claims 1-11 are pending examination.

### ***Double Patenting***

The nonstatutory double patenting rejection is based on a judicially created doctrine grounded in public policy (a policy reflected in the statute) so as to prevent the unjustified or improper timewise extension of the "right to exclude" granted by a patent and to prevent possible harassment by multiple assignees. A nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting rejection is appropriate where the conflicting claims are not identical, but at least one examined application claim is not patentably distinct from the reference claim(s) because the examined application claim is either anticipated by, or would have been obvious over, the reference claim(s). See, e.g., *In re Berg*, 140 F.3d 1428, 46 USPQ2d 1226 (Fed. Cir. 1998); *In re Goodman*, 11 F.3d 1046, 29 USPQ2d 2010 (Fed. Cir. 1993); *In re Longi*, 759 F.2d 887, 225 USPQ 645 (Fed. Cir. 1985); *In re Van Ornum*, 686 F.2d 937, 214 USPQ 761 (CCPA 1982); *In re Vogel*, 422 F.2d 438, 164 USPQ 619 (CCPA 1970); and *In re Thorington*, 418 F.2d 528, 163 USPQ 644 (CCPA 1969).

A timely filed terminal disclaimer in compliance with 37 CFR 1.321(c) or 1.321(d) may be used to overcome an actual or provisional rejection based on a nonstatutory double patenting ground provided the conflicting application or patent either is shown to be commonly owned with this application, or claims an invention made as a result of activities undertaken within the scope of a joint research agreement.

Effective January 1, 1994, a registered attorney or agent of record may sign a terminal disclaimer. A terminal disclaimer signed by the assignee must fully comply with 37 CFR 3.73(b).

2. Claims 1-11 are rejected on the ground of nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 1-24 of U.S. Patent No. 6,553,455.

Although the conflicting claims are not identical, they are not patentably distinct from each other because claims 1-44 in the application are anticipated by claims 1-24 of U.S. Patent No. 6,553,455 (see *In re Goodman*, 11 F.3d 1046, 29 USPQ2d 2010 (Fed. Cir. 1993)).

### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102***

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

3. Claims 1-11 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Steele et al., U.S. Patent No. 5,884,056 (referred to hereafter as Steele).

As to claim 1, Steele teaches a method for providing stream linking in audio/video disk media (see col. 6 lines 13-25), comprising:

when additional reading or writing locations in streams are desired, sending a linked stream request with a number of a primary stream (see col. 9 lines 32-52);

initiating a linked stream that is linked to the primary stream (see col. 6 lines 12-25);

setting a pointer for the linked stream to the same location as a pointer for the primary stream (see col. 6 lines 12-25); and

during operation, processing the pointers for both the linked stream and the primary stream (see col. 9 lines 32-52).

As to claim 2, Steele teaches the method of claim 1 wherein the setting of a pointer for the linked stream to the same location as a pointer for the primary stream further comprises setting a read audio/video pointer for the linked stream to the same location as the read audio/video pointer of the primary stream (see col. 9 lines 22-32).

As to claim 3, Steele teaches the method of claim 1 wherein the linked stream inherits a beginning and ending address from the primary stream (see col. 9 lines 12-52).

As to claim 4, Steele teaches the method of claim 1 wherein the linked stream and the primary stream each include a read audio/video pointer and a write audio/video pointer (see col. 9 lines 12-52).

As to claim 5, Steele teaches the method of claim 4 wherein a passed pointer warning is set when the linked stream read AV pointer passes the primary stream write AV pointer (see col. 9 lines 12-52).

As to claim 6, Steele teaches the method of claim 1 wherein a stream may not be linked to a linked stream (see col. 9 lines 12-52).

As to claim 7, Steele teaches the method of claim 1 wherein the linked stream is disabled when the primary stream is disabled (see col. 7 lines 41-54).

As to claim 8, Steele teaches the method of claim 1 wherein the linked stream and the primary stream may be read and written to simultaneously (see col. 9 lines 12-52).

As to claim 9, the method of claim 1 wherein the linked stream and the primary stream each include a read audio/video pointer and a write audio/video pointer (see col. 9 lines 12-52).

As to claim 10, Steele teaches the method of claim 9 wherein the read audio/video pointer points to the next sector to read from and the write audio/video pointer points to the next sector to write to (see col. 8 lines 14-23).

As to claim 11, Steele teaches the method of claim 1 further including moving the pointers with a command (see col. 9 lines 12-45).

### **Response to Arguments**

**4.** Applicant's arguments have been fully considered but are not persuasive.

Applicant argues in substance that Steele does not disclose initiating a linked stream

that is linked to the primary stream; and setting a pointer for the linked stream to the same location as a pointer for the primary stream.

In response, Steele teaches a system and method including a set of representations of video object "primary stream" such as sequence 52 of fig.7. The user may then use a user interface to select a set of frames "linked stream" from within the sequence 52 (see col. 9 lines 32-39). In response to the user selection, a hypertext link "pointer" request is generated which indicates the selected portion from within the sequence 52 of frames and sent to the server (see col. 9 lines 40-52). The hypertext link that is generated indicates both, the sequence 52 "primary stream" and the selected portion "linked stream" and therefore Steele teaches the limitations "initiating a linked stream that is linked to the primary stream; and setting a pointer for the linked stream to the same location as a pointer for the primary stream".

**5. THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

6. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to HUSSEIN A. EL CHANTI whose telephone number is (571)272-3999. The examiner can normally be reached on Mon-Fri 8:30-5:00.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Ario Etienne can be reached on (571)272-4001. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

Hussein Elchanti

August 25, 2008

/Ario Etienne/  
Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 2157